

ANGLO- SOVIET JOURNAL

JANUARY 1974

Vol. XXXIV

No. 2

Theatre of the Deaf

Science and Philosophy

Soviet Gymnastics

Poetry

30p.

ANGLO- SOVIET JOURNAL

JANUARY 1974

VOLUME XXXIV No. 2

CONTENTS

<i>title</i>	<i>author</i>	<i>page</i>
EDITORIAL		3
MOSCOW DIARY	Robert Daglish	5
POETRY IN THE USSR	Maia Borisova	12
POEMS	Joseph Noneshvili, Maia Borisova	15
SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY IN THE SOVIET UNION	Paul Feltham	22
GYMNASTICS IN THE USSR	James Riordan	31
BOOK REVIEWS		38

Editorial Board:

M. Hookham (Editor) W. W. Begley, Professor R. Browning,
Dr. L. Crome, R. Daglish, Dr. D. Lane, M. Lavery, D. Ogden,
B. P. Pockney, J. W. Riordan, C. E. Simmonds

MAGNOLIA HOLIDAYS

1974

15-Day fully inclusive AIR HOLIDAYS in the **SOVIET Union**



Departures from LONDON (Gatwick). All with comprehensive sightseeing
in either or both **MOSCOW** and **LENINGRAD** or **KIEV**.

Here are a few examples of these tours, all specially designed to ensure that,
with the friendly welcome which awaits you, you will enjoy every minute of
your visit.

IML 2	BLACK SEA 3-CENTRE TOUR	Moscow • Sochi • Leningrad	from £120
IML 3	CAUCASUS TOUR	Moscow • Erevan • Baku • Tbilisi • Leningrad	from £134
IML 4	CENTRAL ASIA TOUR	Leningrad • Dushanbe • Samarkand Bukhara • Urgench/Khiva • Tashkent • Moscow	from £162
IML 5	BLACK SEA 3-CENTRE TOUR	Kiev • Yalta • Moscow	from £120
IML 6	UKRAINIAN TOUR	Kiev • Kharkov • Moscow • Leningrad	from £124
IML 7	BLACK SEA 4-CENTRE TOUR	Kiev • Donetsk • Sochi • Moscow	from £120

Prices include twin-bedded rooms with bath/shower and w.c., 3 meals per day, service charges, sightseeing, transport and portage. Single room supplement £17.

FLY TO A SUPER VALUE 11-DAY CRUISE on the **VOLGA** and **DON**

See Moscow, the Red Square and the treasures of the Kremlin
as well as enjoying a delightful cruise in a superbly equipped
and comfortable river boat between Kazan, the Tatar capital,
and Rostov-on-Don, the gateway to the Caucasus.
Sightseeing at all the ports of call, with guide
interpreters, is by motor coach.

A TOTAL OF 15 DAYS
FROM ONLY £99
Departure from Gatwick
22nd July '74



Offer your clients an exciting and really unique
holiday by sending today for our brochures with the full details of these fascinating tours.



INTOURIST MOSCOW LTD.

292 Regent Street, London, W.1

Tel: 01-580 4974/5

Member of A.B.T.A.



EDITORIAL

Fiftieth anniversaries have followed one after another month by month since the celebration of the half centenary of the October Revolution. We shall soon be marking the fiftieth anniversary of the foundation of the Society for Cultural Relations and we hope to devote the major part of a future issue to this. But in this issue we mark that of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the British and Soviet Governments. One cannot review the twisting turns in the course of these relations since then in a single editorial. But a few words need to be said about them.

The cultural tone of the Soviet scene 50 years ago was one of lyrical hope. The diplomatic relations that were then being established with other countries must have served to reinforce the feeling of confident hope for the future. The Soviet Union then began almost immediately the long haul of industrial revolution and, as E. H. Carr once pointed out, the Soviet and British people alone of all peoples in the world had to face the task of carrying out their industrial revolutions unaided by others. The Soviet Union faced the harder task because it had the additional handicaps of having to feed its own people almost entirely out of its own resources and to deal with the continuing attempts from abroad to wreck its initial industrial achievements. Historians have sometimes described the feverish efforts of the Soviet Union to lay the foundations of industrial production as hot house development. This is an odd sounding term for the efforts of the pioneers who went to build new industrial centres in the freezing wastes of Siberia. Their tasks were forbidding and, although there were great novels written about the way they were tackled, the lyrical tone of the twenties gave way to a muted recognition of the horrors to be endured in the building of an industrial society. The green hills and the dark satanic mills stood once more in contrast.

The sense of elation that crept slowly back into Soviet life, that was acknowledged by Stalin's recognition that life was becoming joyous, was soon blotted out by the greatest horror of industrialism represented by Hitler's military machine.

Two years before Stalin's death the western press began to talk of Moscow becoming the great cultural centre of the world. The USA had closed its doors to bar free access to cultural and scientific congresses and conferences and, in 1951, the Soviet Union seemed to be the only place in which great international cultural exchanges could be effected.

The western countries began to open up cultural and diplomatic relations together and the belated attempts in 1957 by the Macmillan

Government to reach diplomatic and cultural agreements with the Soviet Government marked a big step forward. Since then diplomatic and cultural relations have staggered with unsteady pace back and forward and we are now taking a great stride forward in restoring much of the diplomatic exchange that was halted over a year ago. Much remains to be done to re-open the flow of cultural exchanges.

Two fields in which readers have encouraged further exploration in the Journal are Soviet science and poetry, and in this issue there are two major examinations of these. They help to bring the two cultures together in two senses. One suspects that the man of science in the Soviet Union is knowledgeable about the humanities whereas the western man of science in general is not, but both are capable of reaching an ability to understand the other values across both national cultural and branch of culture boundaries. This is the work that the Society exists to do.

Although this editorial is being written in the flickering light of a candle that evokes thought on the lines of the old cliché about the lights going out all over Europe, there are glimmers of evidence of the sense of excitement and adventure that were present in every branch of cultural life in the Soviet Union in the twenties. Poetry, art and architecture were in this respect little different from the exact and the social sciences. Each branch of culture has its responsibility for its own contribution but diplomatic action is needed to ensure that there is a revival of that cultural excitement of the twenties in spite of the spreading gloom of dwindling natural resources and the threats of pollution.

January 1974 marks the 90th birthday of Ivan Maisky. He first served as Counsellor to the Soviet Embassy in London from 1925-27 and then became Ambassador in 1932. When he gave up office in 1943 relations between the two countries had grown out of all recognition. From the tentative exchanges soon after diplomatic connections had been established Maisky was still in office when the Anglo-Soviet Alliance of 1942 was concluded in a flush of passionate enthusiasm. He often declined to accept personal praise for his part in this, attributing success to the many people who had worked for it. His personal achievement was much more evident in his tireless work for cultural relations. We wish him joy in the memory of this on his 90th birthday.

The Editor

Moscow Diary

Robert Daglish

Deaf Actors' Theatre

In all the notes I have written about the Moscow theatrical scene I have never mentioned the Theatre of Mime and Gesture. My only excuse for such an omission is that I thought it was just another of the mime groups that seem to be fairly common in this part of the world. Actually it is far more than that. It is a company of deaf-mute actors who with the help of dedicated producers, "voices" (speakers) and musicians succeed in putting on a variety of plays, classical and modern, and even musicals, which can be enjoyed both by the deaf and by an ordinary audience. Its current repertoire of 18 productions ranges from the classical *Prometheus Bound* through Schiller, Shakespeare, and Ostrovsky to Alyoshin's *Once in Seville* (Don Juan) and Viktor Rozov's *On the Road*. Both Alyoshin and Rozov rank among the more sophisticated modern Russian dramatists.

Founded in 1962, it is now a large establishment with a company of 43 full-time professional actors and a well equipped modern theatre seating 730 in the Izmailovo district of Moscow.

When I called unexpectedly on a wet November afternoon I was at once made welcome and could not help being impressed by the easy relaxed atmosphere in which producers, ballet masters, some of them invited from other ordinary theatres, and deaf actors work together. Some of the producers naturally rely on manual interpreters but there are also actors from the company, such as Zinaida Solyanik and V. Sokolov who have become producers in their own right.

Natalya Klykova, head of the literary department, began by explaining to me that the term "dumb" or "mute" is never used in the theatre, first because all the actors, thanks to instruction in childhood, can speak a little and, second, because the term implies an inability to communicate which the theatre can and does overcome.

The theatre grew out of the amateur groups that come to Moscow to perform for the two-yearly art reviews held by the All-Russia Society for the Deaf. Even at this stage, in the fifties, such groups were putting on quite complex pieces with the help of interpreters, but since the most gifted members of these groups began to be trained by the Vakhtangov Theatre Studio under People's Artist Boris Zakhava, the technique of articulation plus gesture plus the co-ordinated voices of speaking actors has been vastly developed.

The studio has also opened the road to higher education in theatre art and aesthetics for deaf actors. But, as the producers, mime experts and consultants emphasise, the original urge to produce theatre came from the deaf themselves. The Theatre of Mime and Gesture continues to renew and enrich its company from among the participants in the Society's art reviews, which have provided it with three intakes over the past ten years.

At first this kind of acting seems to be an almost unbelievable feat of co-ordination. Consider the problems. The actor has to make gestures, often using the dactyllic alphabet, and also articulate with his lips while perhaps handling a gun, pouring coffee, climbing a ladder and all the other things one does on the stage. Natalya Klykova, who has been with the theatre since it began, let me into some of the secrets of her profession of literary adaptation. Unlike the ordinary dramatist she must whenever possible avoid the telephone. Nor can she have a third actor doing something significant up stage while two other actors are "talking", because all the attention of the deaf members of the audience is concentrated on following the dialogue. This places a severe restriction on dramatic counterpoint and takes a lot of ingenuity to overcome. Another expert, Inessa Timoshevskaya, explained to me how careful the artists must be about backdrops. Anything in light-yellow, for instance, blinds the audience to manual gesture. Bright manicure can also be confusing. Bright lip make-up, on the other hand, is useful.

For the normal audience the sign language is, at first, of course, a barrier to ordinary appreciation, but it is surprising how quickly one gets used to it. The first play I saw at the theatre, *Antonina*, by G. Mamlin, has been staged at many ordinary theatres across the country. It is a story of everyday life in Siberia with long dialogues between Antonina and her father, who has turned up again after leaving the family 13 years ago because he was then in love with another woman. Antonina does not discover who he is till after she has saved him from drowning in a spring thaw. At first she hates him for his betrayal, but then she finds out that there was also a betrayal, of a different kind, on her mother's part. Her mother had taken the only revenge available to her by moving away from Moscow to a remote Siberian village so that her former husband should never find his daughter again. At this point Antonina throws all her humour and youthful common sense into bringing about a reconciliation between her parents. The play is not outstanding drama but it has some good psychological twists, especially when the father is defending himself against his daughter's sharp tongue, and when she squeezes out of her mother the confession of her reason for going away. "So he betrayed you, and you betrayed me," she concludes.

Marta Grakhova as Antonina, Nikolai Ustinov as the father and Tatyana Silantyeva, the mother, cope admirably with the main parts. Incidentally Grakhova has played on the films. In Vasily Shukshin's picture *Your Son and Brother* she is the deaf-mute sister of a young man who has "temporarily" deserted from the army. In real life she is married to a normal-speaking producer. They fell in love when he came to the theatre to give some instruction in fencing.

Despite their disability, the deaf appreciate rhythm. The normal person tends to associate rhythm with sound, but its mainspring is the heart. The deaf can feel the vibrations of a piano or other instrument, some with the back of the head, some with their cheeks and, having once caught the beat of a dance, they can keep it up. During performance changes of rhythm are signalled to them from the wings.

The theatre has exploited this gift for rhythm to such a pitch that with the help of an orchestra and voices it puts on some entertaining musicals. A forthcoming production of *The Three Musketeers* was written especially for this theatre by the popular song composer Solovyov-Sedoi, whose daughter is a member of the company.

On that first November afternoon I watched two deaf actors, G. Mitrofanov and I. Shneiderman, do a miming act as puppets in perfect time with recorded music, and very funny it was too. They were preparing to take part in a world deaf-mute mime contest to be held in Brno, Czechoslovakia, later in the month. The whole company has toured extensively in Poland, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, and, of course, the other republics of the USSR, which also have their societies for the deaf. But eccentric pantomime is not the theatre's only supplementary genre. The actor Vladislav Shubin, for instance, does mute performances of songs through dance and gesture that are popular among the general public.

Ordinary people react in different ways to this new art. In the theatre foyer during the interval a spokesman for the company is often surrounded by questioners. Some ask the usual questions shyly. Others are fascinated and want to know the whole story. And, of course, you get the occasional insensitive ones. One young man, while I was there, for instance, wanted to know why the company did not stick to mime; it would be much better, gestures just slowed up the action. It was suggested to him that the show was not just for his benefit but, deaf to argument, he marched off to the cloak-room for his coat.

The theatre's manager Nikolai Roksanov emphasised that the theatre caters mainly for the deaf and puts on as many as four new shows a year to provide variety for its regular fans. It works in close contact with the All-Russia Society for the Deaf, which is a largely self-supporting organisation with its own factories and other enter-

prises run on a commercial basis. The theatre does not count on making a profit, he added, but we do cover our expenses. They have plans for a new theatre, in Leningrad, which is to have an apron stage, or perhaps be a theatre in the round, to give the actors even closer contact with the audience.

The production of Aeschylus's *Prometheus Bound* is an example of what the theatre can do to appeal to the general audience. It combines some fine dancing and mime—the human race under the scourge of Zeus, the dances of the Oceanides—with Greek poetry in a fine translation, and an interesting musical setting. Marta Grakhova is appealing again as Io, pursued across the world by the gadfly of the jealous goddess Hera, V. Bondev has a great presence as the fettered Titan, and there is a splendidly sarcastic Hermes (A. Malov).

There is something symbolic of the theatre itself in this ancient classic. Despite all that has been achieved, they are still bound. The foreknowledge of this adds a new dimension to one's appreciation, it may even add a new dimension to what J. B. Priestley called the "sense of theatre". One is always subconsciously aware of the inner struggle. One thinks of the theatre's further possibilities, of the powers still latent in these gifted people.

After the play I even found myself asking whether there had been any cases of a sudden recovery through the therapeutic or hypnotic effects of acting. No one at the theatre has any illusions on this score. There is no wonder cure for damage to the aural nerve. But the effort of articulation, the new impressions, the constant communication with people of wide knowledge and creative imagination, like the chief producer Viktor Znamerovsky, does improve speech. Still more important, it satisfies a deep psychological need. Who knows what further successes and surprises this enterprise may yet bring forth? As Thomas Carlyle once wrote: "Silence is the element in which great things are put together."

Herostratus Shall be Forgotten

Another remarkable Moscow theatre, of quite a different kind, is the Soviet Army Theatre. With its large stage and auditorium and massive stage machinery one might expect it to be constantly putting on heroic spectacles calculated to keep up the morale of the troops. In fact it has one of the most varied repertoires of any theatre in Moscow, ranging from A. K. Tolstoy's *Death of Ioann the Terrible* to Durrenmat's *The Physicists*, and from *The Taming of the Shrew* to *The Dawns are Quiet Here*, the story of a girls' anti-aircraft battery in world war two.

The theatre itself was built, in magnificent wedding-cake style, in the thirties and it has a second, more intimate stage and audi-

torium on the eighth floor. It owes much of its fine tradition to the Popov family. Alexei Popov was the chief producer for many years and his son Andrei, one of the theatre's leading actors, now also holds that post. He may be known to some of the readers of this journal as the English bomber pilot in the popular film of the fifties *Memory of the Heart*, as Iago in Bondarchuk's *Othello*, or as the money-lender in the film version of Dostoyevsky's *The Meek One*. It is a pity no English audience has seen his menacingly subtle Ivan the Terrible, his truly Chekhovian Uncle Vanya or his swash-buckling Petruccio. He is an actor in whom the comic is often near the surface, even in his most tragic roles.

At the end of last season the theatre put on the best comedy of the year, by a new writer Grigory Gorin, whom I had previously known only for his humorous pieces on the back page of the *Literaturnaya Gazeta*. In his first play he shows himself as an astute dramatist with a gift for connecting past and present. *Herostratus Shall be Forgotten* is based on the legend of the Ephesian who so hungered for notoriety that on the night of the birth of Alexander the Great (356 BC) he set fire on the temple of Artemis at Ephesus.

The play opens with Herostratus being thrown into gaol to await lawful execution instead of being torn to pieces by the enraged crowd. But even here, though kicked around by his gaolers, he adopts an unexpectedly arrogant stand. In fact, the play owes a lot to Vladimir Soshalsky's superb performance as Herostratus, for whom he finds just the right blend of bullying insolence, craftiness, insight and insidious flattery. He certainly knows the power of notoriety, especially when it is backed by hard cash. A generous bribe for his gaolers with instructions to stand drinks all round at the local taverns on behalf of the doomed man sparks off a change of mood among the populace and sets the stage for his rehabilitation. In next to no time he has bought himself a stay of execution, become a *cause célèbre* and is writing his memoirs, which are circulated underground at black-market prices. At this point the authorities unwisely issue the decree that forms the title of the play. The decision is all the more unwise because the satrap is busy reading the memoirs himself, not to mention his vivacious but ageing wife who secretly visits the now famous author in gaol with a view to making him her lover. A delicious bit of bargaining follows in which the counters are fame as the great martyr's secret love (for this Herostratus must be executed) or release from gaol and a present of the satrapy, which involves the rather tricky business of disposing her husband. She prefers the former role but Herostratus deploys his guile and flattery towards achieving the latter. The chief justice, the only honest man in the whole show, has to resort to capital crime to save his people from the emergence of a new tyrant, and there is a

splendid democratic twist at the end which shows who, in fact, has been forgotten all along—the builders of the temple.

The high spot of the present season is the opening of *Tsar Fyodor Ioannovich* at the Maly Theatre with Innokenty Smoktunovsky (Hamlet in the Soviet screen version) in his first Moscow stage performance. The play forms the second part of a trilogy by A. K. Tolstoy of which the production at the Soviet Army Theatre mentioned above is the first. I had been looking forward to it immensely, having first enjoyed it many years ago in Leningrad. But despite Smoktunovsky's great performance I came away feeling vaguely disappointed. Smoktunovsky was subtle and intelligent as the gentle son of Ivan the Terrible who wants to reconcile the warring factions (Godunov and Shuisky) of his realm. The play itself is critical realism at its best, analysing the motives of the noble but conservative Shuisky and the more far-sighted but utterly ruthless Godunov. The set was imaginative (a great sweep of white Kremlin cathedral towers, crowned by golden crosses). But something seemed to be missing. Perhaps the set was too magnificent, too spacious for those murky times. Perhaps the music by Sviridov, in itself extremely beautiful, intruded a little operatically on an essentially realistic play. Perhaps Godunov was not villainous enough, although I dislike overstressed villainy. I pondered all this for a long time without finding an answer. Now I think I have it. In the early production the tsar's attempts at reconciliation had been treated lightly; they were almost absurd. Here one is made painfully aware that Fyodor with all his insight and sensitivity is simply no good for the job, whereas Boris is. A disturbing but perhaps salutary thought.

Protest and Compromise

The argument I wrote about last year over the building of a large block of flats just off Peace Avenue and just under our windows has been resolved in a rather unexpected and satisfactory manner. When they started digging the foundation trenches last autumn we told ourselves that this was the end of our nice view of the Moscow skyline and of the fireworks they send up on May Day, V-day and a good many other days besides.

Without much hope I asked one of the foremen on the site what kind of a building it was to be. "Very long," he replied shortly, in a tone that balked any further inquiry on my part.

His information, however, was correct, as far as it went. The new block stretches about 60 yards down the street but, happily, the first 20 yards, directly under our windows, will be a shop only two stories high, then follows a one-storey entrance section, neatly underlying the end windows of a five-storey block on the other side

of the street (where our chief protester lives), and in the open space opposite the ministry further down the main tall block will rise. So a compromise has been reached. The people in the little block of flats will not be shut in by brick walls and the people in our block, which has a cinema on the ground floor, also keep their view. At the same time there will be near-to-work housing for the steel plant designers on the avenue, for whom the flats are being built.

Recently I heard of another example of effective protest to the local authorities. There used to be a very fine chemical goods store on the ground floor of one of the new high-rises further up the avenue. But one evening, after closing time, it caught fire and the building soon began to look like a space rocket belching flames before lift-off. The architect had apparently foreseen such an emergency and provided a very thick insulating concrete roof to the store, the fire service worked rapidly with jets about three feet wide, and the people in the 12 floors above survived what must have been rather a terrifying experience. But when the question of reopening the store was raised recently, they put their foot down—no more chemicals. So now it is to be only haberdashery. Incidentally, another new establishment next door—a large fish shop—will have the psychologically soothing title of “Ocean”.

PROGRESSIVE TOURS PROGRAMME '74

Important innovations include:

- Term-time Russian courses in Moscow and vacation courses at Lumumba University (plus the courses at Leningrad, Dyuny, Moscow, Krasnodar and Sochi)
- Morning classes with Soviet pupils in their schools for groups visiting the USSR for 2-4 weeks.
- Study tours for professional and manual trades unionists using first-class facilities of the AUCCTU, but many open to individuals e.g. Siberia and Central Asia in August 18 days for £267.
- All summer, May Day, November, and short winter holidays.

For all Soviet study, business or holiday travel apply:

**12 Porchester Place, Marble Arch, London W2 2BS
Telephone: 01-262 1676**

Poetry in the USSR

Maia Borisova

(Miss Borisova prepared the following notes to serve as an introduction to discussion meetings during her visit to Britain, and they are clearly not intended to give an exhaustive treatment of the subject; but readers who did not have the opportunity of meeting our recent poet-guests in person will surely welcome the chance of seeing in print what they could not hear her say.)

It is commonly acknowledged that there is a boom in poetry in the USSR at present. And it is not merely a matter of many people writing. In fact the sharp increase in the number of people who write was something that occurred immediately after the October Revolution. As a result, specifically, of this social revolution, not a consequence of enlightenment and good works, millions of young and not so young people ceased to be illiterate and became literate. It is perfectly understandable that the aim they set themselves was not the passive, "cultural" one (learning to *read*), but the active, operative one of learning to write, to express themselves, to speak in the name of those who for long ages through history had found no one who wanted to listen to them, because they were considered a lower order of beings. The first phrase in the Soviet reading primer spoke in the name of these formerly rightless ones and asserted their chief right; it read "We are not slaves. Slaves—not we." (Note: The sentences in Russian are "My—nye raby. Raby—nye my".)

The main point of the present boom in poetry is that we have here a sharply increased number of people able to write on a quite acceptable literary level. One cannot say that this level is exceptionally high, but it is quite "normal" from the point of view of the standards actually required by the organs of the press. In trying to clarify the position both in my own mind and for others, I put forward the following idea, in an article which appeared in the Leningrad magazine "Avrora": perhaps, as a consequence of universal literacy, the ability to express one's thoughts in poetically-organised form has ceased to be a mark of exceptional talent, and has become simply indicative of a certain level of education? After all, our ancestors used to consider the mere production of written letters an art! Even today in Japan, for instance, the writing of hieroglyphs or characters belongs to the realm of art, not just to that of "writing" (as one of the "three Rs"—trans.). Nowadays, when we say of a man "he is literate", it means "he can write". But perhaps if we say of him "he is an educated man", that means he is capable of writing a poem?

About ten years ago, the present boom in poetry-writing was

preceded by an equally interesting boom in poetry-reading, public reading of poetry, and, particularly, listening to the latter. Poetry became the object of universal, passionate love. Poetry evenings drew audiences as large as the hall would hold, plus the extra one, two or three hundred sitting on the floor, on their friends' knees, and practically hanging from the chandeliers. It took about five years for it to become clear that real love in fact implies choice. This, incidentally, was something that our publishing houses contrived to overlook. They thought that if people had fallen in love with poetry, then they would buy the work of poet A just as happily as those of poet B. The result is that today one can often see bookshop shelves piled with verse, and people walking round them saying "No poetry—not a thing to buy". As for the poetry evenings, everything there was not so fine and easy as might appear. I, for instance, now appear very rarely, and without any great enthusiasm, at big poetry events. Why? Because it seems to me that they are attended by people who love all poets without exception. If you look, you will see a member of such an audience clapping this participant, and that one, and that one—and with equal enthusiasm for each. You can see that sometimes it is all the same to him whom he is hearing, whom he is applauding. It is quite another matter when, say, one of the Leningrad factories invites me, specifically and only me, to read there, and maybe they invite me and then make a mix-up over the arrangements so that people have to wait an hour and a half after work; during that time many will have gone home, but for those who have waited I am ready to turn myself quite inside out, it is such a pleasure and so interesting to read for them.

Sometimes I am asked questions something like this—"How do Soviet poets write?" or, "What do Soviet poets think of . . . this or that?" It seems very comical—as if Soviet poets all march in step, work to the same rules, and think in chorus. The merit of a poet, and of a Soviet poet too, lies not in those features of his work which resemble that of others, but in those which distinguish him from all others. Though there are some points in the conditions of our professional existence which are common to all of us, and which seem incredible to poets in most other countries. For example, the concern the state shows in assisting live contact between writer and reader. We have an "All-Union Bureau for the Propagation of Literature", the job of which is in essence the following: not to let the writer forget about the existence of the living reader, or the reader about the existence of the living writer. All the time there are meetings arranged, tours, extra-mural sessions of the editorial boards of journals. And participation in such tours does not have to be sought or fought for, all one has to do is occasionally agree to take part. I, for instance, am not a very mobile person, but when

I think of all the places I have been to at the urging of the Bureau—the Far North, Chukotka, Kamchatka, the Central Asiatic republics—I begin to feel that on a graduated scale of travellers I must be somewhere up with Amundsen. . . .

These tours and meetings are especially interesting and useful for young people.

And talking about young people: the boom in poetry I was talking about to begin with has proved something of a complication in the life of those just coming into literature. Not because no one wants to print young writers! On the contrary! Everyone is very anxious to print young writers. They are so anxious to do so that they cannot wait until a poet has written enough to fill a whole book of normal format—they issue the work of several young poets under one cover, in a set of several slim booklets. The newspapers are very fond of printing groups of poems by young writers. And in doing this they want to give a chance to be heard to as many as possible, after all there are a lot of young people writing! And the amount of column inches available cannot be stretched, they are not made of rubber. . . . But if an anthology is brought out consisting of work by several authors, it has to have some sort of unity. . . . It is a book, and a book cannot contradict itself. The result is that from the poems of the several authors those ones are selected which have something in common. And that means the ones which are not the most characteristic, not the most expressive. The same thing happens with selections printed in the papers. In the event an author can for many long years be having some of his work printed, yet remain unnoticed by the reader. When eventually his first real book comes out, it appears that he is no longer as young as all that—somewhere well beyond thirty. True, recently some new publishing houses have appeared, “Sovremennik” (“Contemporary”) for instance, and some new journals, like “Avrora”, which offer a platform to the young, but still the amount of poetry worthy of appearing in print is far beyond paper supplies and typesetting resources of the publishers.

I have touched on only a narrow range of questions concerning Soviet poetry. But I think that you will raise others, those that interest you most, in your questions. And we shall try to answer them frankly and to the best of our knowledge.

Autumn in Tbilisi

by Joseph Noneshvili

Rustaveli Avenue is where you first feel autumn,
Underfoot the leaves, the leaves of chestnut trees are windswept.

Arriving from Kakheti like a messenger in haste
The perfumed air of wine and fruit flows into Tbilisi.

The townsmen stop and turn about, pursued by wine-filled air,
"Perhaps" says one, "this air is breathed by men in all the world."

And lost in thought he enters through the nearest market gate
With the desire to see, himself, a truly Georgian autumn.

Piled and spread on stands and stalls, each man with his own labour
Brings a harvest for display, for praise and for assessment.

Here are all the blessings and abundance of the autumn,
O may she feast, may she rejoice, may Tbilisi be glad!

The sea of wine, its shores of fruit give pleasure to the eye,
A shimmering headscarf in the wind like an exotic bird.

Stars on a clear night resemble those lights by the stalls—
Fair-haired girls like sunrays and with faces like the moon.

To the right are hills of apples, oranges to the left,
And like drunkards urns and vases lean against the wall.

"Should there be a better wine my name would be dishonoured!"
Shouts convincingly a boy from Kardenakhi village.

Another man from Imereti tries to win you sweetly,
"Kind sir, just taste my wine—you do not have to buy it."

Grapes are praised from Khidistavi, peaches best from Ateni,
Everywhere fruit is acclaimed, described with exultation.

Here are all the blessings and abundance of the autumn,
O may she feast, may she rejoice, may Tbilisi be glad!

Here is autumn in the streets and squares and in the alleys,
Leaves take flight as if with wings from every bustling tree.

A summer breeze? An autumn wind the colour of coral and amber?
Or was it rustling skirts we heard? How could it be the wind?

Even the sun has dared to leave its precincts in the clouds.
Was it a love-song that we heard? How could it be the wind?

Here are all the blessings and abundance of the autumn,
And Tbilisi is willing to be host with open arms.

1950

Translated by Tamara Dragadze

It would have become you to be Queen of Georgia

by Joseph Noneshvili

It would have become you to be Queen of Georgia. . . .
It would become you—how much it would become you.
At one word from you, cities would be built
And gardens would blossom in the desert.
You would captivate men's hearts with one glance
And your shining eye would turn to shadows the sun of Tinatin.
You would bless the warriors
And with the memory of that divine prayer
None of your armies
Would ever be in danger.

It would have become you to wear embossed silk. . . .
It would become you—O, how much it would become you.
Your exquisite face would be protected even from dew
By the most splendid tower carved in ivory for you.
At dawn when ring the bells of Kashueti
The holy cathedral would have resounded with your prayers
And in obeisance to your crown would bow
Your lords, the Orbeliani and the Amilakhvari.

It would have become you to be loved by Rustaveli. . . .
It would become you—Ah, how much it would become you.
Many generations would pass through the many paths of Time
But you would live, my dear, through poetry forever.
A great poet would have endeared you to all the people's hearts,
And we would claim the stars to be your eyes. . . .
And like praises through the ages now long past
I, all the same, would have loved you.

It would have become you to be the Queen of Georgia!

Translated by Tamara Drazadze

Song of Georgia

by Joseph Noneshvili

You are the cradle that green grapevines shelter,
Wonderful tale that the pipes of Pan told,
Heroic song of the noble heart's rapture,
And all in Rustaveli's lines enscribed.

Laved in the blood that our fathers shed freely,
Blood ever hot in this land of the sun,
You rise from earth like a magical fountain
With mountains snow-capped, and with nightingale song.

Into penumbra the eagles sail thickly,
Passing deer move like a swift leaping wind,
It is no wonder all passing by call you
Georgia the beautiful land.

Here Iavrana, Urmuli and Rero
Echo and sound on the lips of the young,
Trellises clustered and circled with grape vines
Sun-gilded wheatfields . . . such rare sights must be sung.

Ripe fruit and nuts are shared round as with brothers,
Shared among children with no selfish thought,
Men trustfully open their hearts to each other,
All doors are open, all give as they ought.

A guest in the home is received as God-given,
Such is the age-old unchanging command,
It is no wonder the passer-by calls you
Georgia the lovely, the beautiful land.

Children in pony-carts, piping of pheasants
Down where the Iori's swift waters flow,
Ancient Tbilisi, our fortress, hope-bounded,
Powerfully built to bring grief to the foe.

Tangerines, roses that flower in December
Filling the gardens with soft perfumed eyes,
Power-stations' thrust like an avalanche bursting,
In mountain peaks great new factories arise.

Everywhere always goes ringing and ringing
Praise after praise to you my motherland,
It is no wonder all passing by call you
Georgia the lovely, the beautiful land.

Who would dare say that our Georgia is small
With all her granaries bursting with rye,
When in her beauty no rival stands by her
When her Mount Elbrus lays hands on the sky,
With red brimming wine the bright cup she is filling
Welcoming spring with her sun-dappled flowers,
To the great land of the Soviets, glory!
Could there be happiness greater than ours?

Proudly it waves, our great motherland's banner,
Gladness on gladness is flooding our land,
Now she takes joy in the title of "Soviet",
Georgia the lovely, the beautiful land.

Translated by Alan C. Brown

Visiting Friends

by Maia Borisova (from *The Chime of Hours* [Chasozvon])

Misfortune strikes my friends:
The children are sick.
But my child is my heart.
My friends are happy:
The children have started school.
But my heart
Grows no wiser. . . .
At home my friends
Have peaceful worries.
But I have only one home—
My heart.
Today my son without even asking
Took another's love
And is not even ashamed. . . .
Today in my home the wiring burned out—
We are using candles. . . .
Heart, my heart,
My foolish son,
What am I to do with you?
To thrash you would hurt me,

*Translated by Debbie Lawton
(student of the University of Durham)*

What miserable shadows wander from these gates
And there creaks what unfastened door?

Grandson, boy,
 you have learned the lessons in school:
God grant that knowledge may be good for you.
You are stepping, laughing, over your fathers' threshold,
And there creaks the unfastened door!

Discover all you need,
 probe all that you desire!
Only the essential wisdom is concealed, believe it,
In this house,
 which now seems so stifling to you,
Where creaks the unfastened door.

*Translated by Susan Walker
(student of the University of Durham)*

Poem (untitled)

by Maia Borisova (from *The Chime of Hours*)

By the path to that picturesque little church
Along the river Nerl. . . .
It came to us resiliently, ringing out
Over the meadow, a puff in the ear,
Which embedded itself in the soul and
lit a star in the sky . . . that
bucolic carved shepherd's pipe from Vladimir
And we were drawn, drawn like
leaves blown across the water by the wind,
helter-skelter, along a slope where a tree
was growing and where, amid swarming clouds
of mosquitoes, on a grassy hillock,
with a pancake-flat cap on his head,
unshaven, with his back to the trunk,
a man was sitting;
Showing excitement in our look,
with a bow, and burning cheeks,
we approached and sat down by him—
asked him to play on.
He smiled into the darkness, the
successful rival's smile.
And putting his pipe, his reed, to his chapped lips

he began to blow into it, passionately,
eyeing our response.
But, not filtered by distance and thus confined,
the rhythm bobbed along clumsily
wheezing at every breath.
Meanwhile on the river there was the silhouette
of a boat,
in which some strange fellow was sitting.
Transfixed like us, he did not come running—
he simply was not interested in that;
With tilted head he was listening
to that carved, pagan, shepherd's pipe
from Vladimir,
ringing out apparently from under the sky,
from under the clouds, reflected
in the water at sunset, its breath
drifting on a level with the thick grass,
within it, resonant souls rumbling, heavily, cowlike. . . .
Nightfall . . . the trickle of water. . . .
A clear, light moon sailing
and the sound of the pipe
calling someone far away, far away.

(This translation is a collective effort made in and by a class in the Russian Dept. at Durham, under Mr. le Fleming, plus a few editorial alterations which we hope this collective will forgive!)

Science and Philosophy in the Soviet Union

P. Feltham

Every working-day of the year IBM, the American "multinational" company spends, on the average, two thirds of a million pounds on computer research and development. In other industries the pattern is similar. Shell, ICI and the German firm Bayer, each invest 60-80 millions annually on "R&D", while the British General Electric Company, which employs about 10,000 scientists and engineers, and well over twice as many supporting technicians, allocates 70 million p.a. to R&D on a spectrum of "electrical" problems.

Although these sample statistics, taken in isolation, are not too explicit as to their fuller significance, they provide an adequate conceptual yardstick with which to assess the vastness of the resources which modern industry must ingest as R&D to remain viable, contract-worthy. Conversely, cut-backs in expenditure may lead to bankruptcy; the recent difficulties of Rolls-Royce stemmed in no mean measure from such "savings".

A more informative view of the significance of these investments would have to encompass the technical and economic efficiency with which these funds are used, quite apart from the relevant question of the social, political and economic determinants of the nature of the researches. A high technical efficiency, through its bearing on industrial productivity, is organically linked with the material wealth of the society in which it is realised; it has a tangible influence on income, education, the general quality of life and hence on political stability in the broadest sense.

In view of the vital involvement of science—the technology of tomorrow—in every feature of life in developed industrial societies, the relevance to the work of the scientist of philosophy, of a world-view consciously held by him, and bearing upon his decision-making, has understandably been a subject of study and controversy. In particular, a vast literature, generally committed, exists about Dialectical Materialism, which has been acclaimed by a number of scientists of high repute and unquestioned integrity as a valuable asset, a guide in their "struggle with nature" while, conversely, men of fame and learning have belittled its uses and, as with Sir Karl Popper, castigated it as "reinforced dogma".

Readers of the *Anglo Soviet Journal* may recall that in my "Bird's Eye View of Soviet Science", published in January 1971, I suggested that this much-disputed issue of the influence of Marxist

thinking on the development of science in the USSR deserved serious study; the references, above, to expenditures on R&D clearly point to the potential practical relevance of such an analysis. Not long afterwards, in fact in the course of 1972, some most informative material was published on this and closely allied topics, so that it is now possible to make a brief survey which, based on quite solid foundations, can yield definite conclusions.

Books and papers

Of the literature which seemed most relevant for that purpose, I want to refer in particular to L. R. Graham's "Science and Philosophy in the Soviet Union" (A. A. Knopf, New York), M. Ellman's "Soviet Planning Today" (Cambridge University Press), and N. Birnbaum's article "The Crisis in Marxist Sociology", which appeared in No. 23 of the Parisian periodical "L'Homme et la Société". Graham's book is devoted mainly to the natural sciences. Apart from a "Background of the Discussion" and a chapter on "Dialectical Materialism: The Soviet Marxist Philosophy of Science", the headings refer to an encyclopaedic treatment of subjects in which philosophical controversy had "raged" most intensely. These include "Quantum Mechanics", "Relativity Theory", "Cosmology and Cosmogony", "Genetics", "The Origin of Life", "Structural Chemistry", "Cybernetics", as well as "Physiology and Psychology". A most valuable drawing-together-of-strings appears in his "Concluding Remarks", and is followed by two documentary appendices: "Lysenko and Zhdanov" and "H. J. Müller on Lenin and Genetics". The book, covering about 600 pages, represents an intellectual achievement of great depth and learning. At the same time it has the welcome additional merit of a lucid, elegant, style, and the inclusion of an invaluable bibliography.

Although Ellman's object is not specifically the bearing of philosophy on economics in the USSR, this problem is illuminated as a by-product of the highly competent analysis of the history of Soviet planning. That definite parallels exist between the difficulties which for a time afflicted genetics, for example, and economics, is abundantly clear from the statement made by some Soviet mathematicians and economists, quoted by Ellman at the head of his first chapter, that "It would be difficult to name another branch of knowledge, with the possible exception of biology, that suffered more from the personality cult than economics".

The analysis made by Birnbaum, though again not exclusively concerned with Soviet sociology, in dealing with current, orthodox, Marxist thinking in this field, also encompasses trends manifest in the USSR.

The wealth of detail contained in these, and other, publications

on the present topic is an enticing quarry for the specialist in individual branches of science; however we cannot stay to search for gold nuggets, and shall only attempt to distil from these analyses the essence of the problem.

Premonitions and panaceas

The full background of the interaction of science and philosophy, and one needs to add politics, in the USSR is the history of the Soviet state. In particular, the darker facets—to many known only through the dramatic Lysenko episode—were largely engendered by the merciless adversity which clawed at the new-born structure at its inception and for many years to come. Lenin was disturbed by a premonition of the coming darkness when, in the heavy year of 1921, he remarked that “we” were “walking on crutches, beaten within an inch of our life . . .”, being convinced that it would take decades to extricate the country from the adverse legacy of the immediate and earlier past if there were no revolution elsewhere. Such a revolution “elsewhere”—Lenin had in mind mainly industrialised Germany—never succeeded.

His forebodings, the ability to see “the writing on the wall”, flowed from his Marxist understanding that an advanced social order could not suddenly take root and blossom forth in a decimated, backward, essentially peasant country. On the slope of this historical inadequacy Russia rolled back to absolutism: a Red Tsar urged into action by the spirit of Peter the Great, yet trailed by the fearsome shadow of Ivan the Terrible.

The menacing constellation of internal pressures, and threads from beyond the borders, and the need for rapid industrialisation—if the ship of state was not to founder—fostered among the nervy upper echelons of the Party, perhaps not unnaturally, a certain predilection for shortcuts and panaceas. This, historically, is a recurrent worldwide phenomenon; suffice it to recall the débacle of the British groundnuts scheme, Khrushchev’s enthusiastic maize-growing, and the burnt-out mini blast-furnaces astride the paddy-fields in the Great Leap Forward. Lenin’s concern over the oppressive legacy of history was not confined to sombre forebodings about the future. He was quite specific about the shortcomings he encountered in the “present”. While 1921 was running its course, he referred to “the bureaucratic and intellectual defects of our apparatus, especially the top drawer . . .” maintaining that “It is time we learned to put a value on science and got rid of the “communist” conceit of the dabbler and bureaucrat”. These shortcomings have their place, though not perhaps a fundamental position, in the pattern of gross political interference in science which was generally legitimised in the USSR by an appeal to Dialectical Materialism.

The history of this phenomenon, sometimes referred to as “Lysenkoism”, with “Zhdanovism” its counterpart in the arts, is well traced by Graham. In our search for the deeper motivations which buoyed up this interference we can therefore forgo the chronicling of detail.

What remains irrefutable is that this interference from the top inflicted great losses on Soviet science and, by implication, to the economy. While the agonies, the embarrassing denouements of ineptitude, nepotism and careerism, where highly detrimental to the image of the USSR, the picture would be quite incomplete were one not to mention also the reassuring facets: the integrity of so many Soviet scientists who, despite the dangers involved, refused to accept a debasing conformity.

Voprosy Filosofii

How do matters stand with the trinity of science, philosophy and the related politics in the USSR today? Professor Graham shows that in the course of the fifties and sixties a *fairly normal* intellectual life established itself in the natural sciences and this normality extended, on *many* technical issues, to the philosophy of science as well. The qualifications, which I have shown in italics, suggest that perhaps some of the old defects, some restraints on expression still survive. This is so. In fact, in the “Concluding Remarks” we find the comment that “The Communist Party officials continue to consider themselves experts on theories of society, and still crudely intervene today in such discussions”. While this observation, taken together with his reference to the continued existence of censorship—in practice carried out unobtrusively by accredited editors—offers a clue to the aims of such interference from the top, they do not allow the underlying motivation to crystallise out quite clearly.

This problem is however treated at some length in Birnbaum’s paper. He finds that it is essentially rooted in propagandist efforts at “system stabilisation”, aimed at fostering a mystique of schematic pictures of the “triumph” of Socialism. Variants of this effort to propagate and instil popular romantic enthusiasm for the *status quo* are, of course, perpetually in operation in all existing states. Plato was far from the first in the history of mankind to wonder “. . . if we could contrive some magnificent myth that would in itself carry conviction to our whole community”.

The price of enforcing taboos and restrictions, which curtails “philosophy” to a political expedient, is its sterility. The sterility of Soviet philosophy has in fact been referred to by Academician Kapitza in a speech published in *Voprosy Filosofii* in 1968, reported in September 1971 in the *Anglo-Soviet Journal*. The well-known Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser assessed the issue, with an icon-

bearing touch, by the comment that “In the Soviet Union and the Peoples Democracies Marxism has been nailed into a rigid frame and elevated to a religion”.

Birnbaum claims to see some relenting of this “procrusteanism” in recent times. This is possible, though hard to judge. The current international détente, following the historical obsolescence of the Cold War, particularly the rapprochement between the USSR and the USA, growing out of a certain economic complementarity of these two “continents”, could be expected to contribute to such a trend. However, the problem in philosophy coincides with that of controls in literature and in the creative arts in general. These were a subject in my article “The Policies of Art and the Art of Politics” ASJ, Jan. 1972), the conclusions of which permit the inference that the preconditions for a basic change, as distinct from trends inferred by Birnbaum, may yet take some time to mature.

There are more things in heaven and earth

At this stage in the discussion it becomes imperative to glance at Dialectical Materialism, to formulate an answer to the Shavian question “What the devil is it all about?”. By necessity we have to be brief, and we shall here content ourselves with a summary of what, on the whole, it appears to mean in the Soviet Union.

Professor Graham considers—and it would be hard to fault his view—that the essence of that meaning is encompassed by the entirety of the following postulates: The world, which is material, consisting of what modern science would describe as matter-energy, forms an interconnected whole which is constantly changing, thus containing no truly static entities. The changes in matter occur in accordance with certain overall regularities or laws. These exist on different levels corresponding to different subject matters of the sciences, and therefore one should not expect in every case to explain such complex entities as biological organisms in terms of the most elementary physico-chemical laws. Man’s knowledge is derived from objectively existing matter. It grows with time, as is illustrated by increasing successes in applying it in practice; however this growth occurs through the accumulation of relative, not absolute, truth. Matter is infinite in its properties, and therefore man’s knowledge can never be complete. The motion present in the world is explained by internal factors, and therefore no external mover is needed.

Every summary necessarily curtails the greater riches of a more detailed account, and the present condensation of postulates may suggest the unjustified inference that an agreed, undiversified, interpretation of Dialectical Materialism is accepted in the USSR. This however would be an impermissible over-simplification. Also,

apart from the need to explain what is meant by some of the categories such as "infinity of properties" and "internal factors", the definitions used themselves undergo historical change and refinement, mainly as a result of the deeper insights into nature afforded by developing science.

Lenin appeared to have brooded over this question of change of concepts, particularly over some metaphysical formulations of Hegel also adopted by Engels. These are still often used in the USSR, and have tended to play into the hands of critics bent on discrediting Dialectical Materialism. As an example it must suffice to mention a paper by M. Omelyanovsky on "Lenin and Problems of Dialectics in Modern Physics", which was presented at the All-Union Conference on Philosophy and Modern Natural Science, in Moscow in 1970, and was published in "Social Sciences" (Vol. 4, p. 84, Moscow 1971). As one of the points of the discussion he attempts to show that the observation that light is found to behave sometimes as if it were a wave, and at others as if it consisted of a stream of particles, supported the Hegelian contention of the "unity of opposites". Few physicists would "go along" with this.

Similarly, the "struggle between opposites" and "the transformation of quantity into quality", postulates which have given rise to so many "theological" discussions and institutionalised clichés, are no more than an archaic expression of the concept of development, and they are rather less informative, because of their anthropomorphic and metaphysical connotations, than the "equivalent" English adage that "the last straw breaks the camel's back".

Thinking in terms of "development" is, of course, potentially instructive, for it opens up a historical view of the world, including not only the "laws of motion of matter", but also those of "highly organised matter", the history of mankind. It helps the scientist also by disclosing the social functions of science and the social determinants and limitations on scientific thinking. That a conscious understanding of continuous change, of "the arrow" of history, of the necessary incompleteness of any theory, can be a definite asset to the scientist is difficult to dispute.

Philosopher's stone?

Several examples, from various disciplines, illustrating this thesis are examined in detail by Graham, and we shall here take but a summary glance at a few. A good illustration is given by V. M. Ambartsumian's criticism of recent theories of the "origin of the Universe". A model, recently discredited, but which was given a considerable build-up in the West a few years ago, was based on the idea of "continuous creation". This theory was counterposed to one still fashionable today, in which the "origin" was traced back to the

exposition of an immensely hot “fireball”. The conception of “origin” and “creation”, with their religious overtones, do not in fact resolve the problem, but simply relegate it to new ones, namely: how does this continuous creation come about, how did the “fireball” develop? This undialectical approach is basically akin to the question of how the Earth remained suspended in space. The ancient belief was that Hercules was holding it up, he himself standing on the hard back of a tortoise. What the tortoise stood on was no longer being asked! One may readily see that such schemata violate several postulates of Dialectical Materialism, for example those referring to the continuous change of “matter” and the inexhaustibility of its properties.

Another case of considerable interest are A. I. Oparin’s views on the origin of life, particularly some of the criticisms of “interpretations” offered in the West. He shows, for instance, that the belief that the virus can be regarded as the crucial link between inanimate and living matter cannot be taken seriously if the structure of complex molecules is analysed in the light of the conditions involved in their development.

From the field of psychology and neurophysiology we shall content ourselves with an excerpt from a passage, quoted by Professor Graham from an introductory article for a 1966 symposium on Soviet psychology. In this Professor A. J. Gray of the Institute of Experimental Psychology of the University of Oxford maintains that “. . . there is a good case to be made for the particular assumptions of Marxist philosophy as a reasonable starting point for a scientific psychology”.

Concerning the failure to use Marxism, particularly by social scientists in the West a comment, relevant at this point, made by Althusser (Lenin and Philosophy, NLB, London 1971) deserves to be quoted:

“As a mass, the intellectuals, on the contrary, even those whose ‘professional’ concern it is (specialists in the human sciences, philosophers), have not really recognised, or have refused to recognise, the unprecedented scope of Marx’s scientific discovery, which they have condemned and despised, and which they distort when they discuss it. *With a few exceptions*, they are still ‘dabbling’ in political economy, sociology, ethnology, ‘anthropology’, ‘social psychology’, etc. etc. . . . , even today, *one hundred years after Capital*, just as some *Aristotelian* physicists were still ‘dabbling’ in physics, *fifty years after Galileo*. Their ‘theories’ are ideological anachronisms, rejuvenated with a large dose of intellectual subtleties and ultra-modern mathematical techniques.”

Some conclusions

The principal conclusions which one can sift out from a study of the influence of Marxist philosophy on Soviet science, which fit into the organic picture of the underlying reality, can be summarised as follows.

Firstly, it is undisputable that Dialectical Materialism, as an evolutionary, monistic view of the world is an asset in planning scientific work, in scientific decision-making; it is useful in about the same way as even a sketch map may help the explorer in travels through strange, largely unexplored country. At the same time such a monistic view is not a kind of philosopher's stone with ownership monopoly confined to Marxists; it has been held, and is being held—in diverse formulations it is true—by many cultured scientists in all countries. Einstein, though conversant with the monism of Spinoza, did not acclaim the dialectics of Engels; nevertheless, throughout the best part of his scientific career he was aware of the incompleteness of his Theory of Relativity, and attempted to broaden it to encompass atomic and sub-atomic processes.

Secondly, propagandist uses of philosophy, just like the use of art as a political expedient, have imposed, and to a lesser extent still impose limitations on philosophical debate in the USSR on a number of "sensitive" topics. This has led to a widely acknowledged isolation and sterility of Soviet philosophy. Sometimes, as in the passage from Ellman's book quoted earlier, these restrictions have been ascribed to "the cult of the individual". Such a terminology is however a facile cover for a more complex process. As Professor Graham points out, it has deeper roots, for soon after the October Revolution the Party "... developed a structure paralleling the government's on every level and controlling the population in almost every field of activity. This population did not object to the controls nearly so much as non-Soviet observers have proclaimed; the government enjoyed the support or toleration of a large portion of the lower classes, who made up the vast majority of Soviet citizenry. The existence of this support strengthened the freedom of action of the Party leaders in intellectual fields, although the intellectuals themselves, a relatively small group, were frequently opposed to Party policies."

Finally, and perhaps decisively, science today has to be considered as an integral part of the entire social structure and economy; in industrialised countries it is a vast industry developing the technology of tomorrow. Viewed in this light, it is clear that the magnitude of the resources, including "human" ones, available for research and development, and of course the cost-effectiveness and organisation of these investments, are parameters which outweigh by far the occasional brilliant insights of a few individuals. Ivory-

tower science is past. More often than not in recent times Nobel prizes have been awarded not to individuals but to teams from well-endowed “centres of excellence”.

Thus while Soviet science has recorded astounding successes, dramatically demonstrated by the first “sputnik”, the under-capitalisation in many fields—a legacy in some ways of historical backwardness and of the enormous losses inflicted on the country by war—has left gaps and shortcomings. This is the case, for example, in computer technology, in the use of liquid fertilisers in agriculture, and so on.

Although comparisons based on simple criteria can often be misleading, Soviet science is, by the admission of leading Soviet scientists, substantially less efficient than American. This is also true of industry, thus supporting our picture of science and technology as “industry”. Exact ratios are difficult, if not impossible, to establish. However, if one takes the *per capita* consumption of electricity as a rough measure of industrial power then, taking the USA and the USSR, this ratio has for some years been close to about 2:1.

Our discussion has indicated that the influence of Dialectical Materialism on Soviet science has been both dogmatic and creative. The effects cannot however be quantified in some simple manner, be it in terms of energy produced, happiness created, efficiency attained, or any other complex mix of such “desirables”. Were it possible, the balance would probably be found to be simultaneously in the “red” and in the “black”. To redress the balance in favour of lasting human advance to a less painful future, one may incline to share the cynic’s view that “so far philosophers have only changed the world, it is now time to study it”.

Gymnastics in the USSR

J. W. Riordan

Gymnastics* in Russia did not begin with Olga Korbut—although she has done more than anyone to focus attention upon the sport. It goes back to the earliest days of organised sport in tsarist Russia. A Swede, de Pauli, opened the first Gymnastics Institute in St. Petersburg back in 1830; the sport was officially recommended to the nobility as “extremely beneficial for health and hygiene”. Just as the German Gymnastics *Turnvereine*, the Czech *Sokol* and the Scandinavian gymnastics movements of the 19th century were attempts to regenerate their people after military disasters, so Russian gymnastics was intended to refurbish the Russian aristocracy, especially after the Crimean War. The first gymnastics circle came into being in St. Petersburg in 1863 and was followed the same year by the famous Palma Gymnastics Society which soon had branches in five other cities. In 1868, the Moscow Gymnastics Society was formed and met in a large hall on Tsvetnoi Boulevard (nowadays the Dynamo Club Gymnasium—where Ludmilla Turishcheva trains). Pyotr Lesgaft, the “father” of Russian physical education, introduced gymnastics on the Prussian model into the army in 1874 and, shortly after, established gymnastics courses for army officers and, in 1896, for civilians. The first national federation for any sport—the Russian Gymnastics Society—was created in 1883, on the initiative of several social reformers, including the writer Anton Chekhov; he expressed the hope, cherished by many intellectuals, that the Society’s members were “the people of the future . . . the time will come when everyone will be as strong and fit; there lie the nation’s hopes and happiness”. As elsewhere in Europe, gymnastics became the basis of physical education in schools, although these were confined to a small proportion of the population. With its narrow base among the aristocracy and spurred on by the rising industrialists, gymnastics had become popular enough at the turn of the century for a team to be sent to the Olympics of 1912 and actually win medals.

The Russian Revolution of 1917 brought the hopes of Chekhov nearer realisation. Lenin himself was an energetic proponent of

* There are four forms of gymnastics popular in the USSR: “sporting gymnastics”, “artistic gymnastics” (calisthenics), “athletic gymnastics” (body-building) and “production gymnastics” (physical exercises at work). The first—“sporting gymnastics” is referred to in this article.

physical fitness; while in a St. Petersburg prison he had written that he did “gymnastics with great pleasure and value *every day*” (Lenin’s italics). He and other revolutionaries had often stressed the role of gymnastics in the new socialist state as contributing to the harmonious all-round development of every individual: “Young people”, he wrote, “need a zest for living; healthy sport—gymnastics, swimming, hiking, all manner of physical exercise—should be combined as much as possible with a variety of intellectual interests that will give young people . . . healthy minds in healthy bodies.”

In the immediate post-revolutionary period, gymnastics in the broadest sense underlay the physical culture campaign. Besides requiring little equipment other than the “best proletarian doctors—the sun, air and water”, it was suitable as a medium for social policies such as the fitness and hygiene campaign, the social liberation of women and the defence requirements. It was believed, too, to satisfy that desire for a *higher artistic quality* which was worthy of the liberated man and woman of the first workers’ state. Mass gymnastics displays in the 1920s—not to be confused with the directed adulatory parades of the 1930s—were becoming increasingly popular: some 18,000 people, for example, took part in a vast gymnastics display at the new Red Stadium to mark the opening of the Second Congress of the Third International in 1920. Lunacharsky, the Commissar of Enlightenment, invited Isadora Duncan to Soviet Russia in 1921 and helped her set up her own academy in Moscow (she actually took Soviet citizenship, married the poet Yesenin and undoubtedly had a considerable influence on the development of “artistic gymnastics”, although she only stayed two years).

Gymnastics, nevertheless, had its opponents, largely because of its association with foreign systems, its nationalistic overtones (from the old Pan-Slavist *Sokol* movement) and its lack of “team-work”. Some antagonists, notably the “hygienists”, argued that it was irrational and potentially injurious to mental and physical health, encouraging individual rather than collectivist attitudes and, hence, against the socialist ethic. Due to “hygienist” influence in education, gymnastics was barred from schools. Other opponents, the Proletkultists, rejected all organised sports that emanated from bourgeois society as remnants of the decadent past and reflections of degenerate bourgeois culture. A fresh start had to be made through the “revolutionary innovation of proletarian physical culture,” which would take the form of “labour gymnastics” and mass pageants. Gymnastics and its “bourgeois” equipment would be replaced by various pieces of apparatus on which young people could practice their “labour movements”. The First Trade Union

Games, in 1925, excluded gymnastics, along with football, boxing and weightlifting—even though these were the four most popular pursuits of the time.

With the onset of rapid industrialisation at the end of the 1920s, however, opponents to gymnastics were swept away (sometimes literally) and, by a resolution of 1933, it became the basis of the sports movement and of physical education in school. It was used, too, as a cultural medium to draw sportsmen into the orbit of culture, being linked to ballet and other forms of cultural expression. The aesthetic value of human movements engendered in gymnastics was thought to be synonymous with that which emanates from art at its best; a new and dynamic cultural force would emerge through graphic symbolisation of gymnastics, calisthenics, the dance and mass formation-displays, as in the newly-founded Spartakiads. By 1940, gymnastics was fourth among sports in registered number of participants. Although no Soviet sportsmen (apart from chess Grandmasters) took part in “bourgeois” international tournaments prior to the war, it is asserted that, by 1941, Soviet gymnasts had attained the top world standards in technique and results. They did not compete against foreign “bourgeois” gymnasts, inasmuch as no Soviet sports association was affiliated to any international federation, Soviet sports policy largely being conducted through the International Association of Red Sports-Gymnastics Organisations which viewed “physical culture, gymnastics, games and sport as a means of proletarian class struggle and not an end in themselves.”

After the war, circumstances and policies changed radically and the Soviet Gymnastics Association affiliated to *FIG* in 1948. Soviet gymnasts made their international début at the 1952 Olympic Games, winning nine gold medals and both the team and individual titles for men and women (a success repeated in 1956). The galaxy of outstanding gymnasts who altered the whole complexion of the sport during the 1950s included such stars as Galina Shamrai, Sofia Muratova, Polina Astakhova and Larissa Latynina among the women, and Victor Chukarin, Boris Shakhlin, Grant Shaginyan and Yuri Titov among the men. Since then, Soviet gymnasts have not monopolised the sport to the same extent; Japanese men and Czechoslovak and East German women have come to the fore. Nonetheless, particularly among the girls, many brilliant gymnasts have graced the sport—Larissa Petrik and Natalia Kuchinskaya in the 1960s and, today, Lyudmilla Turishcheva, Olga Korbut, Tamara Lazakevich, Lyubov Burda and the Uzbek girl Elvira Saadi.

Organisation

Two interlinked elements that underlie the Soviet sports system are the “Ready for Labour and Defence” mass fitness programme

and the uniform ranking system for individual sports for proficient athletes. Both were inaugurated in the early 1930s and both are intended to serve the twin aims—"massovost" and "masterstvo"—on which success is said to be based. While the former sets targets for all-round ability in a number of sports and aims to involve as much as the population as possible in sport, the latter establishes a whole complex of qualifying standards, rankings and titles in individual sports, intended to stimulate the best performers to aim for certain graduated standards. At the top of the ranking system are two sports-titles: "Master of Sport of the USSR, International Class" and "Master of Sport of the USSR"; then come the following sports rankings: "Candidate Master of Sport", "Sportsman First Rank", "Sportsman Second Rank", "Sportsman Third Rank", "Junior Sportsman First Rank", "Junior Sportsman Second Rank" and "Junior Sportsman Third Rank". The two sports titles are honorary for life; the only higher award to which an outstanding sportsman may aspire is "Merited Master of Sport".

How popular gymnastics is in the Soviet Union today may be judged by the fact that over 650,000 people engage in it regularly, three-quarters of whom have gained a sports ranking in the last three years. As many as 600 have reached the Master of Sport level, and 15—the zenith of International Class. To train these gymnasts the country has 18,000 gymnastics coaches and an extensive network of clubs and schools. If a youngster shows talent and inclination, he is likely to be accepted into a junior sports school (of which there are today approximately 4,000) or one of the 63 special gymnastics schools, which pupils attend, free of charge, *after* their normal school day. How seriously the sport is taken in these junior sports schools may be seen from the programme stipulated in 1970 for gymnastics:

Name of group	No. of groups	Age		No. of pupils in the group	No. of sessions per week		Length of each session (hrs)	
		boys	girls		boys	girls	boys	girls
Preparatory	3	9	8	15	2	2	2	2
"Young Gymnast"	3	10	8-9	15	3	3	2	2
3rd Rank	3	12	11	12	3	4	3	2
2nd Rank	2	13	12	8	4	3	3	3
1st Rank	2	15	13	6	4	4	4	3.5
Candidate Master of Sport	1	17	14	4	5	5	4	3.5
Master of Sport	1	18	15	3-4	5	5	4	3.5

A 15-year-old boy or 13-year-old girl attending such a school, therefore, and working towards a 1st Ranking will be working in a

group of about six gymnasts, attending training sessions four times a week for three and a half to four hours each session.

At what age one should start gymnastics is a debatable point among Soviet specialists; it has had to be reconsidered of late in view of the marked reduction in the age of champions. This is due, it is maintained, to earlier biological maturity, improved training methods and a better protein diet. Research statistics for 1946-69 show that men gymnasts took, on average, 9.2 years to reach the Master of Sport level, and women—7.3 years. Members of the USSR gymnastics squad in 1971 took up the sport seriously, on average, at 12.7 years of age. About three-quarters of Soviet gymnastics experts recommend that boys should start gymnastics at the age of 10-11, girls at 8-9—although they insist that the first 2-3 years should be devoted to building up all-round fitness.

If a budding gymnast shows exceptional ability, he may be accepted into one of the relatively new (non-fee paying) gymnastics boarding schools of which there were 21 in early 1973. They follow other specialised boarding schools (e.g., for promising mathematicians, musicians and artists) in adhering to the standard curriculum for ordinary secondary schools, but they have an extra study load in sport theory and practice. In the school I visited near Tallinn (capital of the Baltic republic of Estonia), for example, 12-year-olds spent 25 hours in a six-day week at standard subjects, and eight hours in gymnastics, two hours swimming and two hours P.E. In the last form, at 18 (a year longer than normal schooling), they devoted 23 hours a week to sport, including 19 hours of gymnastics. Roughly the same number of hours must be spent at academic work. The schools' advocates argue that it is an advantage to have the best potential gymnasts organised in well-equipped schools, served by the best coaches, fed on a special nutritional diet and constantly under the supervision of sports instructors and doctors.

If a gymnast does reach the top of the sport, it is expected that he will continue his study in higher education, however disjointed that study may become due to the needs of training and competition (which have first priority). Olga Korbut, for example, is reading History and English at the Grodno Institute of Education; Ludmilla Turishcheva is a student of physical culture in Moscow. Gaining higher educational qualifications is seen as a preparation for a career after active gymnastics comes to an end: Latynina, Muratova and Astakhova are all national coaches; Kuchinskaya and Petrik are now pursuing careers in films and the theatre respectively; Yuri Titov is responsible for gymnastics administration and Grant Shaginyan runs a gymnastics school in his native Armenia.

Being a gymnastics star has its perquisites: Olga Korbut has a

two-roomed flat (with one room being a mini-gym) next door to her coach's family, in her home town of Grodno in Byelorussia. She is able to travel widely and enjoys high esteem in the Soviet Union—though by no means the adulation she receives in the Western world (during the Women's European Gymnastics Championships at Wembley in October 1973, the Soviet gymnastics entourage was obviously perplexed and amazed by the hysteria and security precautions). But there are duties too, not merely to give displays and lectures, but to engage in social work. Larissa Latynina was a city councillor in Kiev for several years; Ludmilla Turishcheva took part early this year with other leading athletes in physical labour on a construction site in Tataria and was prominent in the 1973 Youth Festival in Berlin.

"Secrets" of Gymnastics Success

The "secrets" of Soviet gymnastics success are to be found in a variety of factors, some general and some specifically Soviet. Of prime importance is efficient organisation: the mass fitness campaign allied to a uniform rankings system to encourage gymnastics specialisation with set targets and training programmes at each stage. Organisation also incorporates a meticulous study of training methods; the bulk of the 60-page annual journal *Gimnastika* and the monthly *Theory and Practice of Physical Culture* is devoted to detailed research into the mechanics of movement—of turns, twists, landings, vaults and somersaults. The USSR also benefits from highly qualified coaches and good amenities at top (though not bottom) levels. Factors like selection for national teams and the annual training-competition-rest schedule or "calendar" are also worthy of consideration.

The total efficiency and total resources of the Soviet sports system count for little, however, without personal motivation. Here, Soviet gymnasts (like their counterparts in Eastern Europe and Japan) score highly; in their attitude to training, their hard work and dedication to gymnastics, their personal qualities such as self-discipline, confidence and creativity. They have, too, an artistic *quality* of performance, particularly among the women in the free exercises, that is so uplifting and reminiscent of a fusion between sport and art. Although this balletic grace and musical appreciation is undoubtedly associated with Soviet upbringing, it is not uniquely gymnastic or Soviet—it exists in figure skating (most expertly with the Protopopovs) and is most marked in the gymnastics performances of the East German, Rumanian and Czechoslovak girls.

Put together, all these factors constitute a compelling reason why Soviet gymnasts have done so well in world competition. Yet their

contribution to sport goes far beyond winning medals; it extends to the emulation inspired in millions of young people drawn into gymnastics and the satisfaction enjoyed by many more millions of spectators the world over.

Appeal for Chekhov material from Australian student

The following appeal has been received from a lady in Australia who is engaged on research for a M.A. Thesis on *The Critical Reception of Chekhov's Fiction and Drama in England between 1910 and 1925*:

“Would anyone who has information regarding publications of Chekhov’s plays and fiction or who possesses copies of first reviews of his plays, photographs, programmes or evidence of his influence on the English writers of the 1900s—Mansfield, Lawrence, Joyce, Shaw, Woolf, Synge and others—please send this information to me. Personal reminiscences (performer or spectator) would be equally valuable.

“I am particularly interested in more details of what is claimed to be the first production of a Chekhov play in Britain—*The Seagull* of Calderon and Wareing at the Royal, Glasgow.

“All documents will be promptly returned.”

Please send to: Suzette Thompson,

Dept. of English,
University of Western Australia,
PERTH,
Australia.

BOOK REVIEWS

A History of Realism, by Boris Suchkov, trans. by G. Dauman, *Progress Publishers*, Moscow (*Central Books Ltd.*, London), 1973, 381 pp. £1.50.

This is a major work. It is a very learned and well informed book, by an obvious master in the field of literary and intellectual history. It will be immensely valuable to British students of literature, provided they make one or two adjustments in the use of critical terms. Of these, the most important is, of course, the word "realism" itself. Mr. Suchkov uses it, as has always been usual in Russian, with a much wider field of reference than is given to the English word, itself nowadays usually taken in the narrower sense still of the French "réalisme" (the reproduction of the real without idealisation), the example being Flaubert. In the Russian sense, the fore-runners of realism are Rabelais, Shakespeare and Cervantes, and it embraces all fiction except the fantastic, the lyrical, and the productions of the modern movement which Mr. Suchkov refers to as "Decadent", but which is more commonly called "Symbolist" in the West. The two words "decadent" and "symbolist" were used at the end of the last century, but the word "decadent" has such a pejorative sense in ordinary English and French that it has fallen out of use. Mr. Suchkov takes sides for "realist" (in the wide sense) art, against "decadent" (in the wide sense) art, but the word "decadent", as he uses it, is more descriptive than reproachful. Indeed, the synthetic picture of the modern movement in Western literature and thought, and the analysis of its characteristics, are amongst the book's main contributions to critical writing. The characteristics distinguished by Mr. Suchkov are "subjectivism" and "anti-historicism", or the refusal to think in terms of real historical time: he catches Arnold Toynbee out for seeing something real in the analogy between ancient Sparta and the Prussian State; considered *in concreto* the two are *entirely* different. Western thought is analytical; it overplays the non-temporal notion of "structure", and underplays the temporal notion of "process"; it wants to be timeless.

The background of social and economic history is less new, and it is at times too general to make good reading, though never, except on the question of "alienation", difficult reading. Mr. Suchkov's power of synthesis is as remarkable here as elsewhere. But it is in the effort he makes to see the succession of different "movements" in art and literature since the Renaissance (French Classicism, Enlightenment Sentimentalism, Pre-Romanticism, German Classicism, Romanticism) as a continuous process, in which the "civic" and the "individualistic" strains in the bourgeois consciousness vie with each other, that his grasp is the most apparent.

Mr. Suchkov knows the 19th century novelists of most European

literatures. He greatly admires Maupassant, and appreciates the English novelists from Thackeray onwards, though scolding them for their belief that moral education can bring about the transformation of society. He reproaches Zola, on the other hand, with excessive dependence on physiology. Perhaps Zola's novel *L'Œuvre*, which is not mentioned, would have provided him with a more generous version of Zola's naturalism. But his heart is with Tolstoy's all-embracing genius, and the section on the technique of Tolstoy's epic manner (pp. 172-3) would be worth a place in any anthology of critical writing.

The modern Western novelists are treated with understanding (except Sartre) but great severity. One could reply to Mr. Suchkov that they could not have written at all, had they not written as they did write. This claim, which any writer has the right to make, does not free them from the reproach of being blinkered, any more than Soviet novelists may be protected against the charge of being naïve by the fact that their readers are not sophisticated (in the etymological sense of the word). Mr. Suchkov is of course right, if one places the contemporary Western novel in the wide context of European culture since the Renaissance. Writing for a sophisticated public, their scope is narrow. The "phallic reality" Lawrence strove after hides "the genuine live reality" (p. 233), and all one can say for Huxley's irony, which Mr. Suchkov pours scorn on, is that it really did ease the tension of being constantly in ideological conflict with the Establishment; it was a relief. Mr. Suchkov is of course right *at bottom*: nowadays bourgeois consciousness has become too small a part of human awareness for Western writers to attempt literature in the grand manner. Mr. Suchkov is right when he makes his most general statement, but his being right in principle puts the whole of contemporary Western writing under the negative sign, and this general negation inhibits sympathetic appreciation in a narrower context, particularly in the case of Sartre.

Proust, Mauriac, Thos. Mann, R. Martin du Gard, Faulkner, Hemingway are all treated with respect as masters of prose fiction, and one can even say, with regard to the modern period, that Mr. Suchkov is more at home with questions of literary technique than with the background of history of ideas: his accounts of Bergsonism, neo-Thomism, Existentialism are all too sketchy to be comprehensible. His familiarity with the contemporary Western novelists is extraordinarily wide, and his judgments of detail have the competence of a master, but he cannot go all the way with the "critical" realists of the West, because he has in his mind the ideal of a great epic-realistic literature, as wide in scope as the emergent human consciousness of tomorrow, and, judged by this standard of *Socialist* realism, of which one can say with the author (p. 296) that its full realisation is in the future, the critical realism of the West is negative and limited.

One of the important accomplishments of this book is to prove that it is possible to write the history of a literary *genre*, provided that the author has a point of view from which the whole can be

organised in perspective. Mr. Suchkov has such a point of view: he has an idea of what the perfection of the novel might be, and this finality informs the whole work. It also explains why novelists who are reactionary, in thought or technique, with regard to their generation, can find no place in it, and why fantastic adventures imagined by solitary young writers in bed-sitting rooms, expressing their own phobias and not the concerns of their time, can find no place in it either. It is for novelists, as Mr. Suchkov says (p. 318), to choose their own way. But it is equally right that the critic should have his own idea of what literature can achieve. Critical writing of the scope and technical competence of this book is as valid artistically as any piece of imaginative literature.

The seriousness of Mr. Suchkov's work is impressive. It is a relief to read a book which makes of criticism something more than a pre-prandial intellectual *apéritif* for Sunday mornings, and of literature something more than an article of consumption. Mr. Suchkov's definition of art makes it cognitive as well as aesthetic; he places it on the highest level, and makes of it the expression of man's essential freedom.

I noticed a few faulty re-transliterations and a few slips: p. 29, *read* Nivelles, *not* Niveau, and Chaussée *not* Chausse; p. 89, *read* Vauquer, *not* Voquet; p. 113, *read* Greslou, *not* Greelou; p. 128, *read* Calvez, *not* Calves; pp. 129, 149, 150, *read* Homais, *not* Homet; p. 152, *read* Arnoux, *not* Arnou; p. 156, *read* Georges, *not* George; p. 227, *read* Shaw, *not* Show; pp. 230, 231, *read* Conrad, *not* Conrade; p. 24, *read* "man was", *not* "man is" (born free) (*the mistake leads to a misinterpretation of Rousseau on p. 25*); p. 28, line 18, *read* seventeenth, *not* eighteenth; p. 10, line 6, *read* discovered, *not* has discovered; p. 45, line 37, *read* the Encyclopaedia, *not* Encyclopaedia; p. 61, line 4, *read* the legal, *not* legal; p. 63, line 33, *read* mistrust, *not* defiance; p. 103, line 28, *read* superseded, *not* superceeded; p. 135, line 26, *read* philosophical historians, *not* historians of philosophy; p. 148, line 3, *read* magnum opus, *not* opus magnus; p. 231, line 26, *read* Olde England, *not* Olde Englande.

For a work of such scope the number of slips is minimal.

J. S. SPINK

Mozart: Isslyedovatel'sky Etyud (Mozart: A Study) by G. Chicherin, edited by E. F. Bronfin, Leningrad, 1970, 318 pp.

Most of his life Chicherin, the second Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs, was held in the grip of a double passion: for the revolution and for Mozart. He wrote in one of his letters: "Mozart was the best friend and comrade in a life spent with him, the most complex and subtle, the most comprehensive of all composers, one who stood at the peak of world history, at the crossroads of historic currents and forces." As recently recounted by Chossudovsky (see *ASJ*, Sept. 1973, p. 25), Chicherin's many gifts and accomplishments included piano playing of professional standard. He was likewise

deeply and retentively read in the musicology of all European languages. It is not surprising therefore that he should embark on a book about Mozart. Towards the second half of the twenties he suffered increasingly from diabetes complicated by polyneuritis and was sent for treatment to the German health resort, Wiesbaden. There he collected material for the study, going over all published criticism, and working once more through the scores of the composer's entire music. He put the material together after his return to Leningrad in the form of a long "letter". This he sent to a few friends, writing in the accompanying letter to his brother: "I could just manage the physical task of threading together my Wiesbaden notes and quotations. Bit by bit, that, at least, came off. My weakness is steadily increasing; that, at least, slipped through. The work itself dates from Wiesbaden, here I added to it much of this and that, *ad hoc* and *ad hominem*. The study itself, though only a compilation, I should not have been able to manage any more. Bismarck used to say: 'I loved in my life two things, politics and wine, but politics was taken from me and wine was forbidden by the doctors'. I had the revolution and Mozart. The revolution is our present actuality and Mozart—a foretaste of the future. These two cannot be taken from me."

A copy of the "letter" itself reached Lunacharsky, then Minister for Education, who was enthralled by this, "the first Marxist study of Mozart". (True though the statement may be, Chicherin's Marxism assumes, on the evidence of this study, a most undogmatic form and would have been, one expects, quite unacceptable to the more orthodox keepers of the Word.) Lunacharsky wanted it published, if only in a limited edition and in manuscript form. In 1934 Chicherin agreed to this project and prepared the study for publication in 250 copies, but nothing came of this "for reasons over which the author had no control".

Chicherin died in 1936 and the original manuscript remained with his niece who presented it later to the manuscript department of the Leningrad Public Library. Towards the end of the '50s she began to advocate its publication but was for a time unsuccessful. Finally, however, the present editor, E. F. Bronfin, was entrusted with the publication, a task that proved very laborious since most of the quotations were still in all of the original five European languages and the sources had to be traced and checked before translation. The editor also wrote an accompanying illuminating biographical and musicological appreciation of the work, adding numerous annotations on the sources and personages mentioned in the book. In 1970 the book appeared, 40 years after being written.

The book's form is unusual. In total, a third of it is taken up by quotations from various authors, these being linked by Chicherin's comments and reflections. In this and the openly partisan, often acridly polemical, tone the book resembles such Marxist classics as Engels' *Anti-Dühring* or Lenin's *Dialectical Materialism and Empirio-criticism*.

As expected from what has already been said, Chicherin's

attitude to Mozart is frankly eulogistic. Mozart is to him what Shakespeare is to poetry or Leonardo to painting. He is the arch-revolutionary, the most modernistic of all moderns, past or present. How shamefully wrong are philistines who treat him as one of the charming rococo stylists or as a radiant, smiling "Italian". The Italians have in fact never understood Mozart and are still unable to interpret him correctly. No other composer is as robust, ferocious, more "demoniacal", "orgiastic", "erotic", "universal" and "cosmic"—adjectives thick in the text. In contrast to Beethoven, he is also a completely objective composer. Nor is he merely driven intuitively by God-granted genius. No, most of his work is deeply experienced and carefully planned. He read much in his Augsburg days, including Shakespeare, and saw many of his plays performed. This made of him a psychological realist who perceived human character in its fluid, dynamic complexity. He was further influenced by the "*Sturm und Drang*" currents circulating in Germany prior to the French Revolution. He became a Freemason, drawn to the philosophy of Freemasonry by religious scepticism and by its avowals of human brotherhood. His ancestors were simple artisans and the family spoke the Salzburg dialect at home. In the end he deliberately cut himself off from the respectability and philistine security of Salzburg, setting out on a road that took him to his greatest creative triumphs that could not be understood or accepted at the time, a road that finished in dire destitution and a pauper's nameless grave.

Even now he cannot be fully understood. He is "the least accessible, the most enigmatic, the most esoteric of composers. Those who do not pore over him long and persistently, those who do not ponder over him ceaselessly—to speak to them about Mozart is talking colours to the blind. The enigma of his personality, hidden under a cloak of outward coarseness, his practical jokes, his imponderable depth, is matched by the mysteriousness of his music; the more one delves into it the more one realises how little one has understood it. Who can fathom the depths of the ocean. . . ." His fugue for two pianos, for example, is "the most courageous dive into the depths of all tragic life forces—the evil of Baudelaire—his ideal of Beauty".

Of special interest are Chicherin's reflections on Mozart in the context of modern and, particularly, linear music—Stravinsky, Hindemith and Schonberg. Chicherin seems to have liked and understood the moderns, though he finds Stravinsky too cerebral. Curiously, he is quite silent on Russian 19th century music; one suspects that he is not too fond of the romantics. Could this be another reason why the book was not published earlier? Romanticism is, after all, an integral element of Socialist Realism.

And so one is tempted to go on quoting Chicherin, whose ideas are always arresting, even though he may not be always right. What lovers are? One more quotation will have to suffice: "Mozart shattered the XVIII century and emerged in the future. Elements of the future in him arise from the very essence of his work, which is a

nodal point. He is the very opposite of the formalistic, rationalising, mannered, externally graceful and elegant XVIII century (rococo, which includes elements of the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie), having, however, extracted all its best before destroying it. His synthesis includes also the more distant past; in it there are sounds of old Protestant chorales (*The Magic Flute*) and of Palestrina (in the Masses), Gregorian chant (the *Commendatore*), while in content he is rather a man of the Renaissance (*Gioconda*) than of the XVIII century; *Don Giovanni* is XIV and XV centuries, never the XVIII. In the *Clemenza di Tito* we find, as it were, pre-Raphael art or the Ravenna mosaics; the mystery and vague sonority of his simplest chords is like the primitive and at the same time mysterious images of early Renaissance; and in his depth he is a Hellene, an ancient Greek adorning Eleusinian mysteries with all the enchantments of the flowering earth, sensual orgasm and enlightened cosmism. All this past, the aristocratic, the bourgeois, folk art, that of the artisans and the peasants reaches out to him to the future and enters into the composition of a new world. In him elements of the past are transformed into those of the future. The watershed is passed, the future is his.

“Above all, we find in the Mozartian elements of the future that psychological truth—realism, the enormous variety and inner complexity of characters—not mere copies of daily life but the incarnation of the characters which make him a second Shakespeare and bring close to the psychological novels of the XIX century. Nothing like it has occurred in music after him, nothing like it in poetry after Shakespeare.”

The book is a wonderful surprise for all lovers of Mozart. It was written before his present level of popularity, which was not and still is not as high in the Soviet Union as here. The book will enhance their pleasure in Mozart's music and is shrieking out for rapid translation. (Incidentally, we of the SCR can claim Chicherin as a fellow Brixtonite—he spent six months of 1917 as a prisoner in Brixton jail.)

L. CROME

The Anglo-Soviet Accord by Richard H. Ullman, *Oxford University Press*, 1973, 509 pp., £7.00.

This is the third and final volume of Professor Ullman's history of Anglo-Soviet relations during the immediate post-revolutionary years of 1917-1921. In his first volume, *Intervention and the War*, published in 1961, Professor Ullman examined the origins of British intervention in Soviet Russia in the months between the Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917 and the Armistice of November 11, 1918 which marked the end of the First World War and of the pretence that the mounting Allied intervention in Soviet Russia was prompted solely by the desire to re-establish an Eastern Front against Germany. The second volume, *Britain and the Russian Civil*

War, which appeared in 1968, in the author's own words, "examined the processes by which, after the armistice of November 11, 1918, that intervention was transformed into a campaign whose avowed aim was to unseat the Bolshevik regime in Moscow, and by which during 1919 the British commitment to the anti-Bolshevik side was first enlarged and then liquidated as the perceived costs of intervention, and still more the predictable costs of success, became unpalatably large." The present volume deals with the period commencing in February, 1920, when it was already becoming clear that the young Soviet Republic, though still beleaguered on many sides, would nevertheless win through, and ending in March, 1921, when Britain—the Power most deeply implicated in the anti-Bolshevik intervention—became the first major Power to come to terms with the Soviet Government with the conclusion of the Anglo-Soviet Trade Agreement of March 16, 1921.

The Anglo-Soviet Accord is a treasure-house of information, much of it from sources hitherto untapped. In the words of Professor Ullman, "the primary concern of this volume, like that of both its predecessors, is with the politics of policy making within the *British government*" (emphasis in original—D.O.). There is, for example, an instructive account of the frictions generated within the British "Establishment" by Prime Minister Lloyd George's efforts to reach an understanding with Soviet Russia against the background of mounting militancy among the British labour movement. Professor Ullman traces in detail the story of the intrigues against Lloyd George's policy carried on by some of his own Ministers, notably his Secretary of State for War, Winston Churchill, and by senior military men like the Chief of the Imperial General Staff, Field Marshal Sir Henry Wilson, and Sir Basil Thomson, the Director of Intelligence at the Home Office. Professor Ullman quotes extensively from Sir Henry Wilson's diary, in which we see the Chief of the Imperial General Staff asking whether the British Prime Minister is "deliberately shepherding England into chaos and destruction" and declaring that Lloyd George's attitude "is incomprehensible unless he is terrified of the Bolsheviks *or unless he himself is Bolshevik*" (emphasis mine—D.O.). We see Wilson planning what he himself called "a possible war" on the home front and taking decisions to stockpile rifles, machine guns and other equipment, including tanks, at infantry depots throughout Britain in order to "start off Loyalists". As Professor Ullman rightly comments, "here, indeed, was the rhetoric of full-blown civil war."

Professor Ullman makes use of telegraphic messages between Moscow and the Soviet delegation in London intercepted by British Intelligence. They prove a less rewarding source than some might have expected—"oddly abstract and almost academic" is how they are described by Professor Ullman. Some of these messages are already to be found in published Soviet sources.

But the pre-occupation with British bureaucratic politics, while immensely rewarding and indeed fascinating, leads to a lack of balance, a loss of perspective and a failure to give a fully rounded

treatment of the central historic theme. As a study of bureaucratic politics—*British* bureaucratic politics—it has great merit; as a study of a key episode in the formative years of Anglo-Soviet relations it is frequently less satisfactory.

It is regrettably true that “the materials available for the elucidation of the politics of policy making within the Soviet government are still minuscule compared to the great wealth of those at the disposal of the student of British policy.” But the substantial Soviet material which has been published in recent years makes it possible to give a fuller, more coherent account of Soviet policies and policy-making processes than that given by Professor Ullman. Without such an account, the volume, the overall title of the series notwithstanding, is a history not so much of Anglo-Soviet relations as of British policy towards Soviet Russia, which is not quite the same thing.

DENNIS OGDEN

Polytechnic of Central London

Sotsial'no-professional'ny uroven' gorodskoi molodyozhi
(*The Social and Vocational Level of Urban Youth*), by E. K. Vasil'yeva,
Izdatel'stvo Leningradskovo Universiteta, 1973, 142 pp.

Basically, this book examines the extent to which educational and professional “success” depends on social background (family, sex, social origin, etc.). It is intended to embrace all young people of Leningrad, by sample surveys, in chronological continuity from ten to 30. Thus, three of the four chapters deal successively with children at school, school-leavers and those in their first ten years of work. The findings are based on three sample surveys: 1. that carried out by the author during the 1967-68 school year among 4,824 pupils in forms 3-10 of seven schools; 2. a 5% sample survey of 4,445 young people who had left school between 1963 and 1967, conducted in 1968 under the supervision of G. G. Zaitsev and undertaken jointly by the Sociological Laboratory of the Institute of Ethnography and the Leningrad Finance and Economics Institute; this survey covered 28 schools in two areas: the city centre and the suburbs; and 3. a sample survey carried out by the author in 1970 of 1,137 employees under 30 at seven machine-tool plants.

Some of the revealing findings include the following. Husbands have wages higher than their wives in 73% of families, wives—in only 7%; since girls tend to do better than boys at school, the critical moment of economic sex inequality would appear to occur after marriage and childbirth (p. 15). Success in education clearly depends on family background, children from small, urban families with diploma'ed parents doing best: “in families where parents have a higher education the proportion of pupils with high marks is about treble that of children from families where parents have only seven classes of education” (p. 21). With similar parental background, children do better if the family is small, a fact that is discouraging

parents to have large families (p. 44). The social gap is great in choice of job: while 57% of children of manual workers go into manual work, only 26% of children of diploma'd parents do so (p. 50). A similar differentiation exists in higher education—despite the compensatory conditions created for young people with industrial training and the preparatory faculties (p. 66). The bulk of school-leavers go to work not out of personal choice (only 24% actually chose work in preference to further education); those who did go to work after school did so because of material hardship in the family (12%), a desire for greater independence (18%) or to discontinue study (6%) (pp. 45-46).

The conclusions are that different family circumstances are the main cause of inequalities among young people in cultural and educational levels. While state and public institutions can be fully controlled, there is no means of directly regulating the family's functions of socialisation of children (p. 138). The problem is to compensate for the deficiencies of family upbringing, which may be helped by such measures as "an extensive programme of raising material and cultural standards, particularly by increasing minimum wages, teachers' incomes and the introduction of family allowances for the poorer families" (p. 28).

While being another useful contribution to the "new sociology" in the USSR, this empirical study would be enhanced by a more detailed description of sampling methods, an index and a bibliography—not to mention a title on the spine.

JAMES RIORDAN
University of Bradford

Fifty Lessons in Russian by Nina Potapova. *Progress Publishers*, Moscow, 1972, available from Collet's, 45p.

English students and teachers of Russian are already well acquainted with the thorough and painstaking course books produced by Nina Potapova. The present volume, edited and translated by Natalya Kadisheva, presents beginners with basic grammar and a vocabulary of 1,000 words in graded lessons. The material covers roughly the same as the first volume of Nina Potapova's famous *Elementary Course* on which the Penguin Russian Course is based. It concentrates on nouns, the use of the cases, adjectives, prepositions and the verb aspects, but does not touch on the conditional tenses, participles or gerunds etc. The format is more concise than that of the earlier course with shorter texts and exercises. Explanations in English are brief and to the point. Exercises are rather over-simple for the average student and lacking in inspiration. The approach is essentially "grammatical". The text is enlivened with simple illustrations which are quite useful. The vocabulary at the back of the book provides information about irregularities but not all the words found in the chapter word lists are repeated there. Stress marks are given throughout. There is a key to the exercises but no

grammar reference section or alphabetical index of grammatical points although the initial index is reasonably thorough.

The result is a useful, thorough course suitable for school or college but which suffers from having cramped pages and a generally dull atmosphere.

B. M. KELLEY
Polytechnic of Central London

Modernization and Diversity in Soviet Education by Jaan Pennar, Ivan I. Bakalo and George Z. F. Bereday, *Praeger*, 1971.

This book attempts the very worthwhile task of examining Soviet education in the context of "modernisation"—a handy expression for industrialisation, urbanisation, and social change rolled into one. The book only partially succeeds in its quest. It shows the importance of education as a lever of social change and it has a great deal of data—there are 86 tables in the text and 16 in the appendix. The authors also bring out the continuity and change in education by tracing developments on various topics from pre-revolutionary times. This has the advantage of showing the ways important regional differences have been levelled over time.

The book is in two parts: the first is about general themes in Soviet education at all levels and the second is concerned with regional policy—there are chapters on the RSFSR, the Ukraine and Belorussia, the Baltic, Caucasian, Central Asian and Moldavian republics and the Jews. These chapters have a wealth of data and there are bibliographies which might prove of use to postgraduate students.

A major failing of the book is its inability to appraise comprehensively the particularly political aspects of Soviet policy. A book geared to modernisation theory surely would not conceive of the Soviet government as trying to create a "politically docile man" (p. 98). From the viewpoint of liberal democratic theory, no doubt, this term might apply, but western writers concerned with modernisation would see the aims of Soviet education as inculcating motivations of participation in the political system. There is an obvious lack of comparative awareness—how far is the process of "Russianisation" a result of centralisation, and is this a characteristic of other developing countries?

The writing is uneven, evidently from the lack of integration of various sections completed by the different writers. In places important policy decisions are not fully explored. For instance, we are given no adequate explanation of the move to single-sex schools from 1943 to 1954 (pp. 40-41); the description of the change-over in Central Asia to Latin then to Cyrillic script is superficial. Some of the judgements are questionable: for instance, that vocational-technical schools are "dead-end schools" (p. 267). Overall, and despite some grudging criticism in places of the impact of Soviet policy, the book will prove useful to the student of education by

providing a large amount of reliable information about regional educational policy in the USSR.

D. S. LANE

Classics of Soviet Satire compiled and edited by Peter Henry M.A., *Collet's (Publishers) Ltd.*, 1972, 235 pp. £2.25.

Probably one of the most ambitious undertakings so far attempted in the field of annotated texts, this attractively produced volume (the first of two) contains some three dozen examples of Soviet satire from the '20s and '30s. The authors include famous masters of the art like Mayakovsky, Ilf and Petrov and Zoshchenko, as well as a number of others who deserve to be more widely known. There are brief biographies of each author and explanatory notes on linguistic and other points. There is a mainly Russian bibliography and appendices defining the abbreviations and Soviet neologisms which are so prominent a feature of satirical texts. Last but not least, there is a 20-page introduction in which Mr. Henry of the Department of Russian Studies of the University of Hull, discusses the history and role of Soviet satire and the frequently ambivalent attitudes of its critics in a manner which is always informative and frequently stimulating.

A word of warning is perhaps necessary: the publishers point out that the anthology is intended for "university students of Russian language and literature", and it must be stressed that even with the assistance of Mr. Henry's plentiful notes the volume offers a formidable challenge even to the advanced student.

Some of Mr. Henry's notes will provoke discussion, and some readers may feel that some of his definitions could be bettered—"purchasing agent" or "procurement representative" would seem to be a better translation of "*upolnomochenny po zakupkam*", for example, and it would have been better to have made it clear that "Kukriniksy" was not one but a team of three cartoonists.

But such occasional blemishes in no way detract from the interest and value of this unique volume. Mr. Henry and his publishers are to be congratulated for their enterprise in reaching far beyond the normal limits explored by the compilers of annotated texts.

DENNIS OGDEN
Polytechnic of Central London

Books from the USSR for collectors

RUSSIAN PORCELAIN in the Hermitage Collection

12pp. introduction in English and Russian with 164 full page coloured plates. Dates, Marks, full description, artist and maker, of each item, in English and Russian.

1973. Cloth, 29 x 25cm. 200pp. Ref. 8030.

£6.00

Items from the former Imperial Factory and from privately owned Russian factories are well represented, whilst porcelain of the Soviet period from the '20s and '30s is also illustrated very realistically in colour.

RUSSIAN FURNITURE in the Hermitage Collection

Foreword in Russian with summary in English and 195 full page plates, mainly in colour. Description, period and maker where known, in English.

1973. Cloth, 30 x 24cm. 255pp. Ref. 8031.

£9.50

Specimens date mainly from the 18th and 19th centuries. Very fine illustrations clearly showing detail.

REMBRANDT One Hundred Etchings with a Complete Catalogue of His Prints in the Collection of the Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts, Moscow.

The Pushkin Museum owns 434 impressions from 225 plates. The facsimiles offered vary in size from a few sq. inches to approximately 80 sq. inches, each mounted in a heavy cream folder. They have been described by an expert as absolutely first-class reproductions. They are accompanied by a 20 page brochure in English all contained in a goldstamped imitation leather bound box portfolio.

Published by Aurora, 1973.

Retail price £60.00

Stocks not held but your order will be placed immediately.

DESIGNERS IN SOVIET CINEMA (Khudozhniki sovetskogo kino)
40pp. text in English & Russian. 248 illustrations, many in colour. Cloth,
30 x 25cm. Ref. 8034.

£5.50

The designs cover periods 1920-1940, 1940-1950, 1950-1960, 1960-1970 and cartoon films.

* * *

We very much regret that, owing to a series of delays by the printers, we were unable to publish Collet's new Travel Guide as early as expected. We now have ample stocks and shall be happy to send copies by return if urgently required on receipt of cash with order.

MOSCOW, LENINGRAD, KIEV—A Guide

Compiled by Deana Levin.

192pp. with 3 double page sketchmaps of town centres and three detailed town plans folded separately in pocket.

95p plus 5p postage

Collet's

**Denington Estate,
WELLINGBOROUGH or
Collet's Russian Bookshop,
39 Museum St., LONDON, W.C.1.**

